

# THE LIBRARY.

## TWO LOST CAUSES AND WHAT MAY BE SAID IN DEFENCE OF THEM.

**T**HE defenders of a losing or lost cause have, if they are honest in purpose, at least this point in common with the victorious attackers, that they are endeavouring to discover and establish the truth, to whatever issue it may lead. At any rate in the field of bibliographical encounters we may charitably affect a belief in this community of aim. By the courtesy of the editors of 'THE LIBRARY' some notes on two literary problems which are in one way or another connected with Oxford (the 'home of lost causes'), and are generally regarded as *res judicatae*, are accorded publicity in its pages. As soon as any proof positive is forthcoming all defence of the causes will be given up. In the absence of any overwhelming consideration there is still a certain piquancy about the questions at issue which may claim the interest of readers during an idle half hour, and may even, let us hope, lead in the near future to decisive results.

The two 'Lost Causes' concern the '1468' Oxford printed book, and a supposed Shakespeare autograph in the Bodleian Library. The former has been regarded as a closed question by all bibliographers of the first class, beginning with that prince of book-men, Henry Bradshaw. The second has been ably and weightily discussed by the veteran palæographer, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson ('LIBRARY,' vol. viii [1917], pp. 208-17), and unhesitatingly condemned as a clumsy fabrication. What room is left for any further argument, in the face of such pronouncements? The reply is that in both these questions, though proof is quite possible and probably existent, that proof is not at present forthcoming.

#### A. THE OXFORD 'JEROME' OF '1468.'

The Oxford 'Expositio sancti Ieronymi in simbolum apostolorum' bears the clear colophon ' . . . Impressa Oxonie Et finita An | no domini. M.cccc. lxvij. xvij. die | decembris.' The year-date is stated to be undoubtedly 1478, an *x* having dropped out.<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious that the onus of proof lies on those who believe in 1478. The date is clearly printed, the line is not crowded (there is room for another *x*), and it is believed that in no one of the thirteen copies known is there any correction of the date in manuscript; whereas in the third Oxford book, the 1479 'Aegidius,' all the three copies known

<sup>1</sup> It is not pretended that mistakes in date are uncommon in early printing, but I think they never occur in the first product of a press, and without correction till 250 years after the occurrence.

contain a manuscript correction of a faulty piece of grammar in the colophon. The ordinary arguments are:

1. *The presence of signatures.* The book bears printed signatures, close beneath the text of the *recto* of each leaf in the first half of each sheet. These are first found elsewhere in printing of 1472 and next in 1474 (both at Cologne). Could an isolated printer in a provincial town of England have invented them in 1468? It is not always remembered that every manuscript and probably every early printed book bears, or bore, *written* signatures (for the guidance of the binder), and that all the invention needed was to put the manuscript marks into print in the only position in which they could readily be printed. And if signature-printing in 1468 is voted impossible, what of the 1472 book? It is an equally awkward phenomenon, exhibiting the same want of precedent, the same absence of imitators, the same isolated appearance. As Blades says, 'It is dangerous to assert that a book is wrongly dated because you cannot make it fit into a bibliographical theory.'

2. *The similarity of the printing of '1468' and 1479.* 'In fact,' says Blades, 'if a leaf of the "Jerome" was extracted and inserted in the "Aretinus" (1479), it would, typographically, excite no remark.'

But is this true? The 'Jerome' allows unevenness at the right hand edge of a column; not so the 'Aretinus.' The 'Jerome' starts printing on a i, the 'Aretinus' on a ii. In the 'Jerome' there is a peculiar use of H and Q, not found afterwards. And in 1479 new letters and new colligated forms

are found. There is also the important detail that the 'Jerome' was printed one page at a time, and the 'Aretinus' two pages at a time. In all these points there is a notable difference between the two.

A cessation of some years is by no means uncommon. At Bamberg there was printing in 1461-2; and next in 1481-4, 1487, 1490-1 by the same printer; at Saragossa very similar type was used in 1475 and 1478, but not between; and the next occurrence of printing is in 1481. So at Speier there was printing in 1471-2 and then 1477; and at Lübeck in 1475-6, 1478, 1483. At Reggio d'Emilia a printer named Albertus printed in 1481-1482, and with the *same type* in 1487, but there was no printing at Reggio between those dates. A study of Proctor or Copinger or Burger on incunabula provides plenty more examples.

3. A strong argument for 1478 is derived from a consideration of the *type used*. It is certainly derived from Cologne, and has been developed from Zel's letters. Zel began printing in 1466 at latest. It is more like Arnold ther Hoernen's printing (Cologne, from 1470), and especially Gerard ten Raem de Bercka, of Cologne, whose only *dated* book is of 1478. This argument from Gerard's type is only just not decisive.

4. The argument from other books found bound with the 'Jerome' is quite unsafe, until we find an offset from the '1468' book on books which were bound with it so soon after its issue from the press that the ink had not had time to dry.

When the advocate of 1478 lays out his detailed argument on these four points, the result is a

decided cumulative probability in his favour, and in 1895 and 1912 ('Oxford Books,' vols. 1 and 2), I had to confess that the attack was severe, and that no fresh defending forces were in sight. Indeed, up to this point my readers may well complain that I have served up 'crambe repetita' for their regalement.

But the strange thing is that two more quite fresh arguments can now be adduced, one first available in 1915 and the other in 1917! These are derived from (1) watermarks, (2) the facts about Theoderic Rood's appearance in Oxford. But again, neither is decisive against 1468.

5. *Watermarks.* In 1915 the Rev. Dr. P. H. Aitken, who was then hard at work in the Oxford College Libraries, investigating and listing early books, found time to look closely at the seven watermarks of the 'Jerome,' and to note what is stated about them in Briquet and Likacev. I fully expected that one or more of the seven would be demonstrably impossible so early as 1468. It is truly remarkable that, according to his researches, every one of the seven is found in paper *of, or earlier than*, 1468. If then the printing be of 1479 all the paper used could have been at least ten years old — a most unusual possibility. A further careful investigation should be made in this direction.<sup>1</sup>

6. *Theoderic Rood in Oxford.* The Rev. H. E.

<sup>1</sup> The facts about the watermarks of the earliest Oxford Press are remarkable. Out of 50, no less than 26 are in the first group (the 'Jerome,' 'Aretinus,' and 'Aegidius,' '1468'-1479). The 'Jerome' has seven, of which three are peculiar to itself, but one is shared with the Latteburius of 1482, two run through the whole group of sixteen, and one is shared with the 'Aretinus' only.

Salter has lately been printing the existing records of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem at Oxford, on the site of which part of Magdalen College now stands. He has most ably edited for the College and the Oxford Historical Society (in three volumes) the Hospital's Cartulary and Rentals, and in the course of his work has discovered, not only the precise position of the bookshop in which John Dorne in 1520 sold his almanacs and ballads and books, but also the very spot (now 35 and 36 High Street, just half-way between All Souls and Queen's) where Theoderic Rood lived and printed. The new facts are chiefly to be found in the existing Rentals of the Hospital.<sup>1</sup>

The entries which immediately concern us are as follows, it being premised that the only existing rentals between 1450 and 1490 are for Michaelmas of the years 1453, 1478, 1480, 1481, 1482, 1484, and 1487. The tenement in question, formerly part of George Hall, is thus described :

- 1453. xxs. De domo quam Johannes Mathew tenet.  
vis. viiid. De schopa proxima; idem Johannes.
- 1478. xxvis. viiid. Pro tenemento quod Johannes Ducheman nuper tenuit.
- 1480. xxvis. viiid. De domo in qua manet Dyryke Dowcheman.
- 1481. xxvis. viiid. (*The same.*)
- 1482. xxvis. viiid. Dyryk Rode.

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note, as Mr. Salter warns us, that a rental of 29th September, 1400, for instance, is a prospective, and not a retrospective document. It shows the probable income to be expected from payments between 29th September, 1400, and 28th September, 1401, and *not* the actual income received during the year ending on 29th September, 1400.

1484. xxvis. viiid. De tenemento in quo manet Johannes  
Myssyndene.

1487. xxvis. viiid. Johannes Myssynden taylor.

These interesting and authentic entries show that (1) on 29th September, 1478, a 'Dutchman' named John had recently vacated the house, (2) not later than 29th September, 1480, a 'Dutchman' named Theoderic Rood was occupier of the house until at least 29th September, 1482, and left not later than 29th September, 1484.

Compare this with the ascertained facts of the early Oxford Press. Type 1 (the kind based on Zel's) is found on 17th December, '1468,' in 1479, and on 14th March, 1480. Type 2 (known to be used by 'Theodoricus Rood de Colonia') is found, probably in 1480, certainly from 11th October, 1481, to 31st July, 1482. In 1485 Th. Rood and Thomas Hunte are found, with new type first used probably in 1483, as partners in printing. The last known product of the Oxford Press is dated 19th March, 1487.

Obviously the two sets of data suggest, in perfect accord, that Rood settled in Oxford before September of 1480, and left his house, when he entered into partnership with Hunt, soon after September, 1482.

But our real interest is in the printer (if so be) who used type 1 before Rood came. Rood probably arrived in 1479 or 1480, and certainly became tenant of a house recently occupied by a countryman of his own, named John. He came to print, and some printer with Cologne type had recently, it would seem, ceased to print. It is quite possible

that John was that first printer, and there is nothing whatever in the new evidence to disprove the contention that John first printed in 1468.

The following is suggested as a working hypothesis. John, a 'Dutchman,' came to Oxford in 1468 with Cologne type, founded on Zel's who began to print in 1466 at latest. By 1467 Zel in his attempts to settle the best size for an octavo page had gradually brought down his number of lines in one page from 34 to 27. The first Oxford printer always has 25. In Oxford John of Cologne printed one book at the close of 1468, and then, whether from the opposition of the numerous professional scribes and copyists in the University, or from the failure of the book to bring in money, gave over printing, but kept his type and paper. Time passed, and after ten years of other work he again essayed a book, being not ignorant of the continuous development of printing, nor perhaps of the impending arrival of his countryman. He even improved his fount, but before September, 1478, had given up his house, though he managed to produce, or to arrange that Rood should produce (from the old type, with some additions, and with the old stock of paper) at least two books, the 'Aretinus' in 1479 and the 'Aegidius' in 1480. After this he is heard of no more. Theodoric Rood takes his place, and late in 1480 introduces his new type, and issues the first edition of a classical author in England, the Cicero 'Pro Milone.'

The only point of this part of the article is that, however much probabilities may point to other

conclusions, the conjectural hypothesis just stated doest not at present conflict with ascertained facts. If it elicits at last some decisive disproof, it will not have been put forward in vain.

### B. A SUPPOSED SHAKESPEARE AUTOGRAPH.

An Aldine edition of the 'Metamorphoses' of Ovid, printed at Venice in 1502 in small octavo, and now in the Bodleian Library, bears many Latin sixteenth century notes in foreign hands, and on the title-page, just above the Aldine anchor, 'W<sup>m</sup> Sh<sup>r</sup>' or perhaps 'W<sup>m</sup> Sh<sup>r</sup>.' On the inside front cover of the book opposite the inscription (for there is now no fly-leaf between the two) is written in a rather rough hand, 'This little Booke of Ovid was given to me by W Hall who sayd it was once Will Shakesperes. T. N. 1682,' followed by a kind of Abracadabra knot. A collotype facsimile of the two pages is Plate VII in the quarto (five shilling) edition of the Bodleian 'Catalogue of the Shakespeare Exhibition,' 1916, which can still be purchased from the Bodleian Library.

The little book is a small, dumpy, well-worn volume of 534 pages, with no printed pagination.<sup>1</sup> It was certainly in foreign hands during the sixteenth century, and its blind-tooled binding is German work of about 1550. The first half of the text of the 'Metamorphoses' is copiously annotated in Latin with a fine pen. There are

<sup>1</sup> The Index Fabularum is constructed as if the body of the work *were* paged, and the reader is naively requested to paginate it himself, if he wishes to use the index!

also a few German notes. Then, presumably late in the same century, a schoolboy has drawn gibbets and hanging figures, and sometimes heads or faces in the margin. Only one pen-and-ink sketch has any merit whatever, that on p. 42, illustrating a 'nemus gelidum' and issuant spring of water ('Metam.' ii, 455).

The volume is worn, and while the title-page is smooth and unwrinkled, the front inside cover which faces it, and bears the Note of attestation, is soiled, uneven in surface, and in places wrinkled and rubbed. To write on such a surface with any regularity was difficult, and further wear and tear has affected the writing thus attempted. The theory is that the book was knocking about in some country town such as Stratford-on-Avon, was embellished as described by a grammar school boy, and was picked up by Shakespeare after his retirement to his native town, between 1611 and 1616,<sup>1</sup> and inscribed with his name. His presumably increasing ill-health would tell on his handwriting, and after his death the little Ovid would remain in the family till his grand-daughter (a Hall) died in 1670, and might pass through a relative of hers to T. N. in 1682. Dr. Macray remarks that a William Hall was living in Stratford from 1660 to at least 1684, and that the Nash family was

<sup>1</sup> To show Shakespeare's interest in Ovid from youth to age it is sufficient to refer to Sir Sidney Lee's 'Life of Shakespeare' (1915), p. 20, 'Ovid's poetry filled the predominant place among the studies of Shakespeare's schooldays,' and to the notes about his special indebtedness to the 'Metamorphoses.' As Lee remarks, the name of Titania is from Ovid's Latin text, while the early English translations represent it by Diana.

closely connected with Shakespeare's. Nothing is known of its later history until at the Elkins sale in January, 1865, it was purchased by the Bodleian.

Obviously if the signature is genuine the note is probably genuine; but if the signature is forged, the note may or may not be genuine, for the signature may have been forged to suit a genuine note, or the forger may have fabricated both. Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's powerful and destructive artillery is directed against both signature and note. Of the signature he writes, 'This is a forgery. The letters *W* and *S* are copied from those letters in the principal signatures to Shakespeare's Will. . . . In the case of the *S* the forger has come to grief completely. . . . It is a grotesque idea to imagine Shakespeare writing his name in his books in his death-bed hand.' 'It is a relief to dismiss this clumsy fabrication.' Of the Note he writes, 'The vagaries of this wild impostor,' who makes 'the poet's name like nothing written in heaven or earth.' 'It is an absurd attempt.'

It may seem odd that there should be anything whatever to say, after these denunciations.

### THE NOTE.

The Note may be taken first. Let us assume for a moment that it is genuine. It is obviously a note which would not naturally be written until some years after Shakespeare's death—the expression 'once Will Shakespeare's' shows that. That expression, moreover, may well be, not T. N.'s, but W. Hall's language, in handing on the relic to

a younger generation. As I have stated, Shakespeare's grand-daughter Elizabeth (who was a Hall) did not die till 1670, so the date given in the note, namely 1682, is not an impossible one.

But Sir Edward will have it that the date is 1602, and that the forger wrote the note in 'a style that might, he hoped, be taken for the Elizabethan hand of that period'; in fact he 'tried to give his writing a pseudo-antiquated aspect by introducing pseudo-archaic forms and clumsy exaggerations.' 'The style of writing is not the English script' of 1602. Having set up this puppet of 1602 Sir Edward has no difficulty at all in knocking it over by contrasting it with a specimen of Elizabethan handwriting. 'Why, so can I, or so can any man.' The note is dated 1682, and the writing agrees with that date, and not with 1602.

Every large library of manuscripts has some collection of historical papers bound in chronological order, and if fortunate has so long a series that the papers of a single year may occupy a volume of two or three hundred leaves. The Tanner Collection at the Bodleian Library includes a set of 61 folio volumes covering the period 1559 to 1699. Having the date 1682 for the note, I consulted the volume for that year. I expected to find some of the forms of the note, and not others. The volume (MS. Tanner 34) contains, on 293 leaves, correspondence of, and petitions addressed to, Archbishop Sancroft, written by persons of almost every class of life, from bishops to such as I suppose T. N. to have been, fairly educated men living in out-of-the-way country towns. In fact,

the letter which most nearly resembles in general style and appearance the present note is that of the Rev. John Hodson, who states that he has no servant and has to tend his horse and cows with his own hands, and make the hay (MS. Tanner 34, foll. 126-9).

The result was that I found practically every form of letter used by T. N., and by making allowance for the uneven surface—the appearance of which even a collotype cannot well reproduce—the whole sentence can be fairly represented from scripts of the date 1682. It is impossible to enter much into detail, but the forms regarded as impossible or hardly possible by the critic must receive consideration, though he has 1602 in his mind, and not 1682.

As to the date 1682. The figure 8, when allowance is made for dirt and attrition is the ordinary flat-topped 8,<sup>1</sup> as found on foll. 35, 40, 100, 181, 233, 267, 293, etc. (the reference is to the leaves of MS. Tanner 34). There is no reason for imagining it to be anything else, or of any other year.

The next stumbling block is the 'Tthis.' My view is that T. N. did begin his note with *this*, and did suddenly bethink himself that it would be better with a capital T, and did superpose the T, without erasing the *t*. A careless mistake, and such as a forger clever enough to stand modern

<sup>1</sup> A comparison of the collotype in the Shakespeare Exhibition Catalogue and the half-tone block in 'THE LIBRARY' shows well that the latter process is not fine enough for satisfactory reasoning about details.

criticism and ingenious enough to aim at being 'pseudo-archaic,' would not have allowed for a moment. Erasure would have cured it at once. As to the form of the T, it was T. N., no doubt, who wrote the scribble 'Michael T[ur?]le' above, so naturally he uses the T form familiar to him.

'The *h* is of the modern type, and quite unlike the Elizabethan letter.' I agree: it was impossible in 1602, but common in 1682. Similarly with the *s* final.

'The two *tt*'s . . . should not be crossed high up the shafts: this is quite contrary to the old English tradition.' Indeed it is, but it is on fol. 265, quite in place in 1682.

'The *B* of *Booke* is the creation of the writer's fancy.' Then on foll. 128<sup>v</sup>, 129<sup>v</sup>, it is the creation of John Hodson's fancy, and on fol. 14 the creation of Dudley Loftus's fancy, both in 1682.

'The *k* here is a monstrous letter which I think I have seen in other forgeries of past years.' The formation is found on foll. 12, 101, 135, 157— which are not forgeries.

'The *f* of *of* is simply impossible.' I have not found the precise form in MS. Tanner 34, but the shape was familiar to every writer of that date as the first half of a double *f* and of *F* when written as *ff*, and near approximations can be found on foll. 149, 174, 180, 190<sup>v</sup>.

The other letters do not require to be considered in detail, but following the order of the criticism, for *v* see foll. 20, 34; for *w* *passim*; *g*, a careless form, see near approximation at foll. 30, 190<sup>v</sup>, 212, 258, 271; *b* and *y* *passim*; *W.* and *H.* *passim*; *s*

foll. 9, 34; *c*, *S* *passim*; *k*, see above: *p*, see foll. 104, 126, 141, 149; *r* is nearly as foll. 125, 129, 164; *h* *passim*; *s* medial, *passim*.

The *Will*, supposed to be first written *Wicc* and then altered, is only made thus peculiar by the proximity of a deep wrinkle in the paper. No forger would write *Wicc*. Why should he? T. N. seems to have had the same difficulty in the *h* of *who*.

It would appear that the unnecessary assumption that 1682 is 1602, and that the 'forger' wished to be archaic, has really permeated the whole of the critic's argument. The writing in detail can be fairly paralleled in 1682, and foll. 126-9 (as stated above) are a letter with a similar *general* appearance to that of the note.

#### THE SIGNATURE.

This, though of course much more important, can be treated more briefly.

1. An abbreviated signature, such as the one before us, is undoubtedly possible early in the seventeenth century, but it would be at any time unusual enough to challenge immediate attention. He would be a bold forger who called attention to his effort. On the other hand the fact of abbreviation would entirely justify the book's owner in writing a note of explanation.

2. The writing seems to me to be at any rate earlier than the year (1778) when the Will signatures, on which the forger (if he were one) would depend, were first engraved and made available for imitation. Scientific forgeries on the other

hand, such as could stand the criticism of the nineteenth century without collapse, could hardly have been executed before that century. The Chatterton and Ireland forgeries for instance are mere clumsiness.

3. It seems to me quite possible that the *S* is shaped in Shakespeare's way, that is, that the first (upper) curve of the modern *S*-shape is shorter than in *S*, and that the second (lower) curve is continued upwards and sweeps over the top in an arch. Apparently the letter was started too near to the *m* of *W<sup>m</sup>*, and the writer had to complete the second half and the upper part by interruptions of the natural sweep of the pen in at least two places. Moreover, old paper of 1502 in a worn book is not adapted to receive the rising strokes of a fine pen without the point catching in the fibre. It will be noted that in at least two of the three Will signatures there is a failure to carry out the sweep.

4. With respect to the senility of the handwriting, it is true that the *S* is shaky, but the *W* is firmly drawn, and (as has been suggested to me) Shakespeare seems to have written straight lines firmly, while in drawing a curve he appears to be not at his ease. The theory, as before stated, is that he was not far from his end when he acquired the book, and that the surface of the old and worn paper was such that firm, flowing writing was difficult.

5. Perhaps the most cogent argument for genuineness is that the *m* of *W<sup>m</sup>* exhibits a marked peculiarity, in that the third down-stroke is broken-backed, as a man in feeble health might write it. The pen completed half the stroke and then slid

a very little to the right before it went on downwards. This oddity might be accidental, if it stood alone, but it occurs also in one of Shakespeare's undoubted autographs; not in the three Will signatures, but in the Mortgage signature of 11th March, 1613, now in the British Museum. It is a good deal to expect us to believe that the 'forger' had access, not only to the Will (or even, if so be, to the engraved Will signatures), but also to a document which was not engraved till 1790, and was in private hands till 1864, the year before the book was acquired for the Bodleian; and that he was clever enough to notice this minute trick of Shakespeare's and deliberately introduce it. Not only so, but he must have been thorough enough to discover a special knot-mark on p. 63 of the Ovid and imitate it in the mark which he appended (see p. 97 above) to the forged initials.

The sum of the matter is, not that any one can feel sure either of the date '1468' or of the Shakespeare signature—the probabilities are against both—but that, in spite of scientific criticism, neither problem has reached the stage of definite decision. We may find a copy of the 'Jerome' altered in a contemporary hand to 1478, or discover from contemporary evidence that Oxford printing did begin in 1478; and we may come across a confession of the forgery of the signature in modern times, or a form really impossible in 1682; but until some such discoveries are made, it is permissible to hesitate in running counter in the one case to a clearly expressed date and in the other to an attested signature.

F. MADAN.

## THE DATE OF ANTHONY MUNDAY'S JOURNEY TO ROME.

**B**Y the few facts, concerning the life of that versatile journalist of doubtful reputation, Anthony Munday, which have been rescued from obscurity, we are indebted chiefly to the work of John Payne Collier; his life and bibliography are still the starting point for all literary investigators. Collier is, however, in error on several matters, and one of these is the date of Munday's journey to Rome, described with great detail in one of his most interesting works, 'The Englishe-Romayne Lyfe.' The date Collier gives is 1577, but an unprejudiced examination of the facts of history and Munday's own evidence will show that he must have left England in the autumn of 1578, and returned in the summer of 1579.

However low the opinion of Anthony Munday's veracity no one has yet suggested that 'The Englishe-Romayne Life' is not autobiographical, and there is absolutely no reason to suppose that this account of his travels and his sojourn in Rome is not wholly trustworthy: the part played by the 'hero' is far too characteristic of his none too creditable career to allow us to be mistaken. It

will be best, therefore, first to examine his own evidence, as given in this book.

The first date Munday gives is that of his arrival at Milan, on Christmas Eve; the next is that of his arrival at Rome, on Candlemas Eve, that is, on 1st February. As he visited Boulogne, Amiens, Paris and Lyons before coming to Rome, and apparently stopped some little time in Paris, it is necessary, having regard to the conditions of travelling in those days, to infer that he must have left England fairly early in the autumn; probably, however, not before the end of August, as on 2nd August, 1578, John Alde, his employer, was fined for publishing without a license a ballad of his, entitled 'Mundaie's Dreame.'<sup>1</sup>

A downward limit is given to the possible years in Chapter I. In reporting a conversation with a certain Dr. Griffin, with whom he dined on Christmas Day at Milan, Munday represents Dr. Griffin to have said, 'I am sure you have heard what credit Captain Sukelye was in with the Pope, and how he was appointed with his armie to inuade England: he beeing slayne in the battaile of the King of Portugall things went not forwarde as they should have done.' The 'battaile of the King of Portugall' is the Battle of Alcazar, which took place on 4th August, 1578, and it is an accepted historical fact that the notorious adventurer Captain

<sup>1</sup> II Die Augusti, 1578. John Aldee. He is fined at a Court holden the date abouesaid. to paye. V<sup>l</sup> for printing iij ballades for Edward white, and Mundaie's *Dreame* for hymselfe. without a lycence . . . V<sup>l</sup>. *solutum.* (Stationers' Register, ed. Arber, II, 847.)

Stukeley was killed in it. This, therefore, fixes the downward limit for Munday's arrival in Milan as Christmas Eve, 1578, and he would, according to this reckoning, reach Rome on 1st February, 1579.

Similarly an upward limit can be fixed by the fact that in October, 1579, John Alde is entered in the Stationers' Register as having licensed to him Munday's 'Mirrour of Mutabilitie,' in the preface to which the author gives a short sketch of his adventures on first landing in France. We know from 'The Englishe-Romayne Lyfe' that he was in Rome over Carnival time; we know from the Stationers' Register that 'The Mirrour of Mutabilitie' was licensed in October, 1579; and we know from the preface to this work that Munday had published his 'Galien of France' only a short time before; it is therefore only legitimate to assume that he must have returned to England some time in the early summer: and thus the date of his journey would appear to be easily ascertained.

When, however, we find two such writers as John Payne Collier and Richard Simpson both asserting 1577 or earlier to be the date it is necessary to obtain further and more conclusive proof when venturing to disagree. In his account of Munday in his edition of 'John a Kent and John a Cumber,' edited for the Shakespeare Society, Collier states that 'Munday was unquestionably in Rome in or before 1578, because he informs us, in his "Breefe Aunswer," that he had seen Captain Stukeley there; and that adventurer perished in the Battle of Alcazar, which was fought on 4th

Aug. in that year.' Now there is at least one error in this short sentence, if not two. In the first place, the statement to which Collier refers is not in the 'Breefe Aunswer' at all, but in 'A Breef and true report of the Execution of certayne Traytours,' in which Munday writes, referring to his intercourse with Luke Kirbie, one of the condemned priests, in Rome:

Master Kirbie (quoth I) to deny your owne dooinges  
is mervailous impudencie: dyd not you in your chamber  
delyver to me certayne silke pictures, which you tolde me,  
at Stukelyes beeing there, were hallowed by the Pope . . . ?

In the second place, Collier interprets this statement as meaning that Munday had met Stukeley in Rome; whether or no this is a straining of language is debateable; but it is certainly equally permissible to take it to mean that the silk pictures were hallowed in the presence of Stukeley, and not that Munday received them when Stukeley was present. Collier errs on the wrong side arbitrarily to assert, on these grounds only, that Munday saw him in Rome.'

Richard Simpson, in his detailed biography of Stukeley,<sup>1</sup> quotes Munday's question to Kirbie, and considers that it refers to this 1575 grant of silk pictures, because, 'as Munday had returned to England from Rome in 1577 the grant must have

<sup>1</sup> In all probability we can date the grant of these indulgences to Stukeley: in a letter to a certain Mistress Julyan he writes: 'I send you by this bearer half-a-dozen of pictures wrought upon taffyta . . . From Rome, the 24 of October, 1575.' (Lansdowne MSS. xx, no. 44.)

<sup>2</sup> 'The School of Shakespeare,' vol. i.

been either in 1575 or 1578. In another book of Munday's, "The English Roman Life," 1582, there is also a mention of Stukeley. He saw at Rome, he says, "Stukeley and three more Popish gentlemen in great credit with the Pope. . . . These three other gentlemen came from the North of England, and were to go forward with Stukeley in the enterprise, and to have the Pope's army committed to their conduct, and so to overrun England, and to make kings and dukes and earls at their pleasure."'

Here, indeed, is confusion worse confounded: in the first place, Simpson gives no proof of the assertion that Munday returned to England in 1577, and yet bases his date of the grant upon that fact. In the second place, it is either a case of ignorance of 'The Englishe-Romayne Lyfe,' or else of quoting it from a very imperfect recollection. The sentence that Simpson purports to be quoting runs thus (Munday is quoting Dr. Griffin—their host at Milan, not Rome—and the occasion of the conversation was their meeting with three English gentlemen at the house of a certain Master Harris):

I am sure you have heard what credit Captaine Sukelye was in with the Pope, and how that he was appointed w<sup>h</sup> his Armie, to inuade England: he beeing slayne in the battaile of the King of Portugall thinges went not forwarde according as they should have done. These three Gentlemen came foorth of the North partes of England, taking upon them to goe forward with that, which Stukely had enterprised, which was, to have the Popes Armie committed to theyr conduction, and so they would over-

<sup>1</sup> 'The School of Shakespeare,' vol. i, pp. 107-8.

run England at their pleasure, then they would make Kings and Dukes and Earles everyone that they thought well off.'

The whole sentence would be entirely meaningless, if it were not for the statement made at the beginning, that Stukeley was then dead, and had been dead for a sufficiently long time to enable these three Englishmen that Munday had met to come from the north of England to Rome to persuade the Pope to give them the leadership of what would have been Stukeley's expedition, had he survived. By itself this sentence at once puts both Collier's and Simpson's cases out of court.

To turn, however, to the historians for final and conclusive proof of the date: this would be obtained by dating the quarrel between the English and Welsh students in the Seminary, which occupies such a large part of Munday's book. Seeing that the result of this quarrel was the taking over of the College by the Jesuits, one would naturally conclude that the occurrence would be mentioned with some detail by their historians: and so it is: this very quarrel, in which Munday was evidently personally concerned, is the subject of the 12th chapter of Daniello Bartoli's 'Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Giesu l' Inghilterra Parte dell' Europa.' MDCLXXVI.<sup>2</sup> His account tallies in every particular with that of Munday, and the quarrel came to a head, he tells us, in Lent, 1579—'quaresima del settantanove.' Incidentally, as if to give further proof of Munday's veracity, Bartoli mentions that it was one 'Ridolfo

\* Sig. C recto et verso.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 44-6.

Scervvino, Sacerdote,' who made the appeal to the Cardinal on behalf of the students. Munday refers to the incident in this way: 'Maister Sherwin, who was executed with Campion, being there esteemed a singuler Scholler, bothe for his eloquence as also his learning: made answer for them all after this manner.'

If further confirmation still be sought the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' art. 'Clenocke,' dates the events of this quarrel with even greater accuracy. According to the modern method of reckoning it began in February, 1579; in March the Pope gave the management of the College into the hands of the Jesuits; and on 23rd April, 1579, Father Alfonso Agazzari—the 'Father Alfonso' of Munday's book—was made rector. An even more interesting and detailed account is to be found in Dodd's 'Church History of England,' in the long account devoted to the founding of Roman Catholic Colleges abroad. The appendices<sup>1</sup> to this chapter are also extremely interesting; and a full description of the whole affair is given in a letter from Richard Haddock, one of the students, to Dr. Allen, the original of which was formerly at Douay College. On the last of February, according to this letter, Haddock, with Sherwin and six others, went to the Cardinal, and were told by him, even as Munday states, to 'obey Dr. Maurice,'<sup>3</sup> and accept of him as their rector'<sup>4</sup> It would be wearisome

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Tierney; vol. ii, pt. iv, art. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Appendices lvii, lix, lx.

<sup>3</sup> i.e. Dr. Maurice Clenocke—the 'Dr. Morris' of Munday.

<sup>4</sup> cf. 'Eng.-Rom. Lyf,' sig. i, iii: 'but bad the depart home again, and shew themselves obedient to the Rector.'

some to enumerate all the corroborative details of this letter, and one more example will suffice; Munday's account of the actual departure of the English students runs thus: 'Well, on the morrow morning wee went our way, with bag and baggage, to an Englishman's house in the Cittie, and as I remember, his name was M. Creede, where to make ready our dinner, everie one took an office upon him. . . .' Haddock writes: 'The next day in the morning, we departed the house unto one John Creed's, our countryman's house, all together: where we all dined that day.'

Neither Collier nor Simpson seems, apparently, to have noticed the one piece of valuable evidence on their side. In the edition of Hakluyt's 'Voyages,' published in 1589, there is an account of 'The worthie enterprise of John Fox an Englishman in delivering 266. Christians out of the captiuitie of the Turkes at Alexandria, the 3. of Januarie 1577.' At the end of this account there are some 'Verses written by A. M. to the curteous Readers, who was present at Rome, when John Fox receiued his letters of the Pope.' They are signed with his motto, 'Honos alit artes,' and his usual initials, A. M. Besides these verses, in the margin, is the

<sup>1</sup> E.-R. L. sig. 111ij verso.

<sup>1</sup> Further confirmation of Munday's account can be found in the letter of Dr. Lewis to Dr. Allen, on the same subject. The appendices also contain an account of the disturbance as given by Clenocke (copy formerly in Douay College: of doubtful authenticity, according to Tierney), and the petition of the scholars to the Pope. (Ad Gregorium Papam Petatio Scholarum Anglorum Seminarii de Urbe; original in English College at Rome, Lib. 304. Scritt. vol. 29, no. 23.)

statement, 'I was at Rome in the English house when Fox was there and received his letters.' Appended to the account are 'The Bishop of Rome his letters,' and these are dated, 'At Rome, the xx of April 1577.' Therefore, either here, or in 'The Englishe-Romayne Lyfe,' Munday is lying, for there is no reason to suppose that he visited Rome in 1577, and again in 1578/9, and every reason to suppose that he did not, as it is hardly likely that even the most amiable of masters would have allowed his apprentice of only a few months' standing to set off on what was, from a business point of view, merely a wild goose chase across the continent.<sup>1</sup> The question is, therefore, where would he be more likely to lie? In a small contribution to a very large book, or in a small but independent and exceedingly interesting volume, bound to arouse much commentary, and also furious contradiction from the Jesuits? There is no doubt that while it would pass unchallenged in *Hakluyt*, the slightest inaccuracy in 'The Englishe-Romayne Lyfe' would have been eagerly seized upon by his enemies, and it is noteworthy that all the accusations of falsehood brought against him by the Jesuits are entirely unproven. If we had only Munday's two conflicting statements between which to choose, this reason would hardly be sufficient to allow us to assume that he was departing from the strict truth in *Hakluyt* rather than in his own book; but, when all the evidence that can be adduced confirms this, it is only logical to assume that the

<sup>1</sup> Munday was apprenticed to Alldे on 24th August, 1576.  
(See S.R. *Inrollments of Apprentices*.)

date which is supported by the facts of history is the correct one; and so, on these grounds 1578/9 is put forward as the date of his journey to and sojourn in Rome. If it should be suggested that the whole matter savours somewhat too much of 'settling *Hoti's* business,' the only reply is, that, if literary research is to justify its existence at all, then its duller facts must be accurate, as well as its brilliant truths.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE.

## THE CANON OF JOHN HEYWOOD'S PLAYS.

*(Conclusion.)*

N the first part of this paper the history of the Canon was traced, and the plays attributed to John Heywood by a long tradition were found to arrange themselves in two trilogies. It was shown that there was no doubt as to the authorship of 'Weather,' 'Love' and 'Witty and Witless,' but the evidence supporting the traditional ascription to Heywood of the other trilogy, 'Four PP.,' 'Pardoner and Frere,' and 'Johan Johan,' was found to be less convincing. Much depended on the degree of assurance with which the 'Four PP.' might be claimed for the dramatist. This question was discussed in some detail, and it was found that the claim for Heywood rested on good evidence both external and internal. It was suggested, however, that the 'Four PP.' trilogy bore the marks of the influence of the dramatist's older friend and patron, Sir Thomas More. I next propose to consider the problem of the date of the 'Four PP.' and the bearing of this on the question of authorship.

It will be remembered by readers of the play

that the Potycary refers in the story of his wonderful cure to the loss of the good ship 'Regent':

*Potycary.* This tampion flew X longe myle levell  
 To a fayre castell of lyme and stone  
 For strength I know not such a one  
 Whiche stode upon an hyll full hye  
 At fote wherof a ryver ranne bye  
 So depe tyll chaunce had it forbyden  
 Well myght the regent there have ryden

In August, 1512, Wolsey wrote to Fox that there had been a severe sea fight near Brest on Tuesday fortnight where the 'Regent' captured the great carrick of Brest, but both fouling, were burnt and most part of the crews with them. Sir Thomas Knyvet and Sir John Carewe had perished. He begs he will keep the news secret. The French fleet had fled to Brest. Sir Edward Howard had vowed 'that he will never see the king in the face till he has revenged the death of the noble and valiant knight, Sir Thomas Knyvet' (B. M., Titus B. 1. 99).

The 'Regent' was probably the biggest ship added by Henry VII to the Navy. She was of 1000 tons, was built on the Rother in 1487 and was well known to Londoners ('Navy Records,' vol. 8). A drawing in colours showing the two ships aflame forms the frontispiece of 'Navy Records,' vol. x. Out of her crew of over 700 only 180 escaped, and but six from the carrick, the 'Cordeliere.'

We are told that Henry seemed quite satisfied

with the result of the 'drowning' of the carrick and rewarded the messenger with £10.<sup>1</sup>

The impression made by the tragic end of the 'Regent' may be gathered from the contemporary chronicles.

The 'Chronicle of the Grey Friars' under the year 1512-13 records:

This year the king went to France and the carrick and the Regent burnt and this year was the Scottish Field and the king 'tane and slayne.'

The 'Chronicle of the time of H. VII and H. VIII' (Camden Soc.) says:

And on St. Laurans day was the Regent of Ingland and ye grete Carricke of Fraunce burnd which was ii of the gretest shippes of Christendom.

In dating the 'Four PP.' it will be necessary to bear this naval disaster in mind. A bigger ship, the 'Great Harry,' soon took the 'Regent's' place, but the tragic circumstances of her end must have long remained vividly in memory. The allusion to it, therefore, quoted above, would be quite natural in the earlier part of Heywood's first period at Court (1519-28).

It has been argued that the 'relics' passages in the 'Four PP.' are developed from those in the 'Pardoner and Frere,'<sup>2</sup> and with this conclusion there is probably considerable agreement. Assuming then that this is so, the allusion to Leo X

<sup>1</sup> In 'Hickscorner,' which was probably written before the disaster, the 'Regent' heads the list of ships.

<sup>2</sup> Hillebrand (Mod. Phil., Sept., 1915).

(1513-21) in the latter play calls for attention. It is true that the playful exaggeration of the passage reduces its value. We have, indeed, quite a jumble of Popes; Julius the sixth has yet to exist, Boniface the ninth belonged to the fourteenth century, whilst there is an Innocent and a second Julius whom we cannot identify.

It is, however, with the express sanction of Leo X that the Pardoner opens his appeal to his congregation, commissioned by him to grant indulgences to all who shall give alms for the restoration of the chapel of 'sweet St. Leonard, that late by fire was destroyed and marred.'

It was in 1517 that Leo X had authorised the famous sale of indulgences to all who would contribute money to the building of St. Peter's. The farcical satire, therefore, of the 'Pardonere and Frere' would be received with full popular appreciation if the play appeared when Pope Leo's pardoners were becoming nuisances. The play might be placed, on such an assumption, about 1519.

The sale of indulgences by Leo X had, however, excited opposition of a much more significant character in Germany. On the Eve of All Saints, 1517, Luther nailed his ninety-five theses against indulgences on the door of the palace church at Wittenberg. But Luther's revolt took time to spread, and it was not until 1521 that Henry VIII felt called upon to register a regal protest and publish his 'Defence of the Seven Sacraments.'

It is obvious, therefore, that should a Court dramatist produce a 'Pardonere' play while the

King was in this very orthodox mood, he would define his position with considerable clearness, and leave his audience in no doubt as to the correctness of his attitude.

Now this is just what Heywood does in the elaborate and lengthy conclusion of the 'Four PP.'

The Pedlar sums up the whole matter at issue in a speech beginning

Now be ye all evyn as ye begoon  
No man hath loste nor no man hath woon.

First, addressing the Palmer, he declares that he who 'for love of Christ' uses to go on pilgrimage spends his time well. The motive is all. To the Pardoner he says,

If ye procure thus indulgence  
Unto your neyghbours charytably  
For love of them in god onely,

then the Pardoner is working to the same end as the Palmer.

And so it is with all who 'by ayde of goddes grace' follow any kind of virtue, whether 'great almyse for to gyve,' or 'in wyfull poverté to lyve,' or to make 'hye wayes and suche other workes,' or 'to mayntayne prestes and clarkes to syng and praye for soule departed.' Though these virtues be of 'sundry kyndes,' yet if men are moved by 'love and dred obediently' to work 'unyformely in them, they are pleasaunt to God and thankful to man.' But if by 'grace of the Holy Goste' a man be moved specially to one virtue let him beware

of 'despising other,' for he perceives that to be the sin of the Palmer and the Pardoner.

One kynde of vertue to dyspyse another  
Is lyke as the syster myght hange the brother.

Here the Potycary rejoices that he has escaped such perils by 'using no vertues at all,' wherefore he is rebuked by the Pedlar, who, however, sees in the truthfulness of his remark 'one syne of vertue.' Yet he adds significantly,

I dare well reporte  
Ye are well beloved of all thys sorte  
By your raylynge here openly  
At pardons ond relyques so leudly.

The Potycary retorts :

In that I thynke my faute not great  
For all that he hath I knowe conterfete.

In a passage quite in Heywood's style, the Pedlar replies that he is not constrained to reverence what he knows to be feigned.

But where ye dout the truthe nat knowynge  
Bilevynge the beste good may be growynge  
In judgyng the beste no harme at the leste  
In judgyng the worste no good at the beste

But as the churche doth iudge or take them  
So do ye receyve or forsake them  
And so be sure ye can nat erre  
But may be a frutfull folower.

The three disputants acknowledge the excellence

of the Pedlar's counsel and promise amendment,  
and Heywood then closes the play in two stanzas  
of Rhyme Royal invoking all

To beleve hys churche faste and faythfully  
So that we may accordynge to hys promyse  
Be kepte out of errour in any wyse.'

And all that hath scapet us here by neglygence  
We clerely revoke and forsake it  
To pass the tyme in thys without offence  
Was the cause why the maker dyd make it  
And so we humbly beseche you to take it  
Besechynge our lorde to prosper you all  
In the fayth of hys chnrch universall.

I have quoted thus extensively because it seems to me necessary to insist that Heywood is here definitely asserting a position in harmony with that of the 'Defender of the Faith.' I would therefore not feel any necessity to place the 'Four PP.' earlier than the date of Henry's book. I think, however, that it was probably not separated very far from the 'Pardoner and Frere' and would assign it to 1521-2, though it might be as late as 1525. The Royal favours shown to Heywood in 1521 suggest the earlier date which is also supported by the reference to the 'Regent.'

I have already dealt with Dr. Wallace's summary of the life of Heywood. In his treatment of the Heywood Canon he boldly eliminates the 'Four PP.', the 'Pardoner and Frere,' and 'Johan Johan,' which he equally boldly attributes to the 'Octavian Shakespeare,' Wm. Cornyshe, the Master of the Chapel Children. Cornyshe, he holds, framed the

'new style drama' in the 'first plastic years of Henry VIII, and that drama was a square break from the past.' He repudiates the notion that Heywood was a 'link,' a 'transition,' or a 'bridge.' There is in his view no bridge, but a 'square break,' and Cornyshe is the great originator.

Of the 'Pardoner and Frere' he says: 'The King held no revels at Christmas or the New Year of 1518 on account of the plague. In the lull Cornyshe probably wrote the 'Pardoner and the Friar,' commonly attributed to Heywood because no one else seemed to be in sight to father it upon. . . . No other known dramatist but the impossible Medwall was then writing.' 'Moreover the play was written to satirise the Bull for the sale of indulgences issued by Leo X in 1517.'

Dr. Wallace offers no real evidence, but notes as a coincidence that there were left over at the Revels Office in 1518 materials for a Palmer's Masque. Readers of the 'Four PP.' will know that Palmers had nothing to do with indulgences, nor indeed is there a Palmer in the 'Pardoner and Frere.' ('Evolution' p. 50 f.).

Of the 'Four PP.' he writes: 'A milder piece of satire on the same theme, the "Four PP." attributed to Heywood by the publisher Middleton (1543-7) must have preceded the "Pardoner and the Friar" as Pollard and others have believed.' He adds: '"Johan Johan" undoubtedly belongs to the same dramatist.'

<sup>1</sup> Henry Medwall appears to have died early in 1509. See presentations to the living of Newton (dioc. Norwich), Pat. Rolls H. VII, 17 Sept. 1494 and 12 Jan. 1509.

‘Whilst we are about it,’ he says, ‘we may observe that no other dramatist than Cornish was then living who had either opportunity or impetus or skill to write in the manner of his new style drama three other plays, viz: Of Gentleness and Nobility, The Four Elements, Calisto and Melibœa.’

Nothing is known of Cornyshe’s writings except his lament entitled ‘Truth and Information,’ and some ditties which are quite short. ‘Truth and Information,’ written in prison, deals with his sorrows in the abstract terms familiar in the Moral Interludes. Little as this may imply, it is nevertheless just from those abstractions that he is supposed to have made his ‘square break.’ In this connection it is significant to note that in none of his works does Heywood revert to this convention, except in the play of ‘Weather’ where we have the Vice, Mery Report. For instance, ‘Witty and Witless’ is the theme of a debate, whereas ‘Wit and Science’ in Redford’s play are characters, personified abstractions. The style of ‘Truth and Information’ hardly encourages one to think that its author could command the less awkward manner of the ‘Four PP.’, much less the easy movement of ‘Gentleness and Nobility.’

Enformacion emboldyde of the monacorde  
from consonantes to concordes, he musyde hys mastry.  
I assayde the musykes bothe knyght and lorde,  
but none wold speke: the sound-borde was to hy:  
then kept I the playne keys that marde alle my melody;  
Enformacion drave a crochet that passyde alle my song  
with proporcio parforche drevon on to longe.

He is not always so enigmatic; the last stanza, the twentieth, ends very happily.

I kepe be rownd and he be square  
 the one ys be mole and the othre be quary:  
 Yf I myght make tryall, as I cold and dare  
 I shold shew why theys ii kyndes do vary;  
 but God knowthe alle; so doth not kyng Harry,  
 for yf he dyd, then change sholde thys my song,  
 Pyte for pacyens and conscyens for wrong.

Me nysshewe parabolam f(ecit).  
 (Royal, 18. D. 2. f. 163.)

The song is prefaced as follows:

In the Flete maade be me William Cornysshe otherwise called Nysshewhete, Chapelman . . . Henry VII, his reign the XIX yere (1502) the moneth of July. A treatise betwene Trowth and Enformacion. A. B. of E. how C. for T. was P. in P. (A Ballad of Empson; how Cornyshe for Treason was Put in Prison.)

(See Edn. Halliwell Phillips.)

This poem does not appear to be at all in the manner of any of the six plays that Dr. Wallace claims for Cornyshe. Its curious and subtle metaphor is nowhere reflected in them. On the other hand, whatever is curious in Heywood, his verbal repetitions and rhyming vagaries, we find in the 'Four PP.' If the plays were Cornyshe's we might reasonably expect to find in them examples of his quaint subtleties.

If Cornyshe is the important writer Dr. Wallace considers him to be, it is remarkable that he is not mentioned by Bale, who at least assigns the 'Four PP.' to Heywood and the 'Four Elements'

to John Rastell. Now Dr. Wallace denies that Bale attributes the latter play to Rastell. 'Edidit,' he insists, means 'published,' not 'wrote.' But Bale (1557) uses the word 'Edidit' in speaking of Heywood and his works, and Heywood was not a printer.

Although it has no immediate connection with the Heywood Canon, I propose to examine further Dr. Wallace's statement as to the authorship of the 'Four Elements.'

In a well-known passage in this Play, Experience is instructing Studious Desire in the secrets of Cosmography from a figure or chart. He points to the 'great oceyan' which had never been crossed :

Tyll nowe within this XX yere  
Westwarde be founde new landes.

But what comodytes be within  
No man can tell nor well Imagin  
But yet not long ago  
Some men of this countrey went  
By the kynges noble consent  
It for to serche to that entent  
And coude not be brought thereto

But they that were the(y) venteres  
Have cause to curse their maryners  
Fals of promys and dissemblers  
That falsly them betrayed  
Whiche wold take no paine to saile farther  
Than their owne lyst and pleasure  
Wherfore that vyage and dyvers other  
Such kaytyfies have distroyed

O what a thyng had be than  
 Yf that they that be englyshe men  
 Myght have ben the furst of all  
 That there shulde have take possessyon  
 And made furst buyldynge and habytacion  
 A memory perpetuall.

It is a very remarkable fact, and one that has hitherto escaped notice, that Rastell himself was one of the 'Venterers' alluded to in this passage, and that he actually, when writing this play, had his own voyage in mind. I regret that my transcription of the depositions in the case 'Rastell v. Ravyn,' heard before the Court of Requests, is too lengthy for reproduction, but I give the opening of Rastell's Bill of Complaint :

Piteously compleynyth unto y<sup>r</sup> gracious highness y<sup>r</sup> pore subject Jhon Rastell, that wher he intended a viage unto the new found land by your gracious mynd and assent to whom yo<sup>r</sup> grace grantyd yo<sup>r</sup> letter written under yo<sup>r</sup> grete seale directed as wel to all yo<sup>r</sup> subjects other cristyn princes and theyr subjects for the fortherance of the same. And for the same viage yo<sup>r</sup> sayd orator reteynyd in his service John Ravyn to be purser of a shipp called ye barbara Which seyd ravyn contrary to ye trust yt he was put in and contrarye to all trewthe deseyved yo<sup>r</sup> seyd orator causyd and compelyd hym to gyff up his viage to his gret losse and furthermore, etc. . . .

(R. O. Court of Requests, 3/192.)

In his eagerness to show how much the Tudor Drama is indebted to Cornyshe, Dr. Wallace has been less than fair both to John Rastell and his son-in-law. The contention that Bale's use of the word 'edidit' in the 1557 edition instead of

'reliquit' as it appears in the earlier version, implies that Rastell only published the play, is not very convincing.

The earlier version is as follows:

Magnus iste cosmographus de trium mundi partium Asiae Africæ et Europæ descriptione, longissimam reliquit comediam quam vocabat.

Naturam Naturatam li. 1. (1548)

The later version runs:

Insignis hic cosmographus, de trium mundi partium, Asiae Africæ et Europæ descriptione, ingeniosissimam ac longissimam comediam primum edidit, cum instrumentis et figuris, quam vocabat.

Naturam Naturatam li. 1. (1557.)

Speaking generally, I find that Bale uses the words 'scripsit,' 'fecit,' 'composuit' of works in manuscripts, and 'edidit' of printed books. In compiling his 'Scriptores' such a distinction was natural in view of the fact that printing was a new thing.

He uses 'edidit' of Sir Thomas Eliot's 'Dictionary,' 'Castel of Helth' and 'Gouvernour,' but adds 'aliaque fecit multa.'

Of Latimer's printed sermons he uses the word 'edidit,' and adds, 'dicitur etiam scripsisse . . . commentarios.'

Speaking of himself he uses the word 'edidi' of his 'Scriptores,' but also gives a list of works he 'collected and wrote' ('colligi ac scripsi').

Dr. Wallace's assumption then that Rastell printed, but Cornyshe wrote, the 'Four Elements' may be dismissed; and so too, surely, must his extraordinary

claim for Cornyshe that he alone had the 'opportunity, impetus or skill' to write the best plays of his time.

In dismissing summarily the possibility of Heywood's authorship of the 'Four PP.' trilogy, Dr. Wallace was clearly influenced by the question of dates. As I have pointed out in an earlier paper, he assumed that Heywood began his career at Court in 1528, when actually he had completed nine years of service and had obtained a pension for life.

We may therefore rest satisfied that Dr. Wallace has no better grounds for attributing the 'Four PP.' plays to the 'Octavian Shakespeare,' than he had for assigning to him Rastell's 'Four Elements.'

Nevertheless the problem of the Heywood canon is the question whether Heywood is the author of the 'Four PP.' trilogy; and in determining it, much depends on whether Middleton was right in attributing to him the play that he printed.<sup>1</sup> The burden of my argument has been to show that the evidence supports this attribution. Once that point is settled, it is not unreasonable to attribute to him also the 'Pardoner and Frere.' Hillebrand, as I have pointed out, has shown, what most readers have probably felt, that in one play use is made of the other. The case of 'Johan, Johan' is uncertain. The play does not contain the common characteristics of Heywood's undoubted work. Yet I have shown that where this play departs from its French analogue, it is in a direction that we might expect in Heywood's treatment. Two of the three

<sup>1</sup> 'Four PP.'—'made by John Heewood.'

plays belong, I believe, to the early years of Heywood's court service, and I have shown that he entered that service under the *ægis* of More. I have noted the similarity in theme, form and spirit that exists between the trilogy and 'More's verses on 'How the Sergeant would play the Friar'; and I have suggested that Heywood's early successes at Court were due in no small measure to his intimacy with More.

In concluding this series of papers I should like to record an interesting reference to Heywood that I have discovered since I wrote the article 'John Heywood and his Friends.' It occurs in Letter Book O in the Town Clerk's Records at the Guildhall.

20 Die Januarii. Dodmer Maier. (1529-30).

John Heywood citizen and Stacyoner of London and oon of the kynges serauntes ys presented by Maister Rauff Warren Maister Wardeyn of the Mercers to this Courte as Comen Mesurer or meter of lynnyn Clothes to occupie by hym or his sufficient depute and to doe Right and equally betwene all parties. And also he ys transmuted from the saide craft of Stacyoner unto the mistery of Mercers by thassent of bothe the saide mesteres.

This record is interesting for several reasons. It shows that Heywood, having been put on the list of life annuitants by the Crown in 1528, a substantial privilege, was welcomed a year later by the foremost of the London Livery Companies. It supports my contention that Heywood's first period of Court activity culminated rather than began in 1528. Further it is noteworthy that

1529 was the year in which More became Chancellor. It is interesting to find that the Company that Heywood first joined was one in which his father-in-law John Rastell the lawyer and printer must have had many friends. Neither Rastell nor More, however, were members of City Companies, being members of their Inns, but More's influence in the City was very great.<sup>1</sup> I pointed out in an earlier paper (viii, p. 263) that Heywood's name appeared in 1537 in a list of the members of the Ironmongers Company to which his son-in-law, John Donne, belonged, but if this refers to the dramatist, he must have been 'transmuted' again.

ARTHUR W. REED.

<sup>1</sup> Another instance of More's influence in the City in 1529 may be alluded to: 'At this courte Sir Thomas More Chauncelir of the Ducye of Lancaster recommended oon Water Smyth nowe his seruaunte and hath contynued w<sup>t</sup> hym by the space of viii or ix yeres to the Rowme of the Swerde berer yn stede and place of Richard Berwyk late nowe decessed . . . et postea . . . Walterus admissus fuit' (Letter Book O, f. 168 b). Walter Smyth was the author of 'The Twelve Gests of the Widow Edyth,' printed by John Rastell in 1525, and written therefore while Smyth was in More's service. The curious reader will find in this interesting example of early Tudor humour a view of the domestic side of life in the household of Sir Thomas More, which may serve to keep him in touch with the atmosphere of the sixteenth century. The office of Sword Bearer was then, as now, the office of a 'gentleman,' and one of much importance.

## SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

**T**O those of us whose work lies among books, it is an immense encouragement in these times of stress to know that our French allies, to whom the actual turmoil of war is so much nearer than it is to us, are, nevertheless, publishing works of serious literature—works that form a contribution to general learning. ‘*L’Art Chrétien*’ of Louis Bréhier, with its 241 illustrations and its some 400 pages of letterpress, is sufficient testimony to such activity.

The volume deals with the evolution of Christian iconography, points out the relations between the Christian art of the East and Western Schools, and, in placing together literary texts and sculptured and pictorial monuments, brings out the variations of religious thought that characterise each era. The first part of the book follows ordinary lines: we have the funerary symbolism of the catacombs, the subtle language of which is only accessible to the initiated; the triumphal art of the Constantine period, anxious to affirm the victory of orthodoxy; the theological, abstract, and argumentative art of

<sup>1</sup> Louis Bréhier, ‘*L’Art Chrétien son développement iconographique des origines à nos jours.* 30 fr. (Laurens.)

## SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 133

the Byzantine empire; the realistic and pathetic art of the Christian East as revealed in the frescoes of Cappadocia; and the encyclopædic art of the West. This takes us to the twelfth century. In the second part, the author sets forth an original theory of the development of religious art. He finds that at the end of the thirteenth century a similar movement of mysticism invaded the souls of men throughout Europe, and thus a mystical and realist tendency triumphed first in Greece and Italy, and then in the fifteenth century in the whole of Europe. He notes how, from the second half of the sixteenth century, religious art follows the development of profane art; and he points out how virtuosity and dilettantism destroy the religious sentiment. Only Tintoretto escapes; and in an eloquent passage, too long to quote, Bréhier sings the glory of his great Venetian pictures of the 'Crucifixion' and the 'Paradise.'

Coming to modern times, Bréhier passes in review the work of French masters like Flandrin, Puvis de Chavannes, Tissot and others, and the Englishmen, Burne-Jones, Watts, Ford Madox Brown, Millais, and Holman Hunt. He sees distinct hope for improvement in the future, and regards the cathedral being built at Barcelona as the realisation in part of Claudel's church of the future.<sup>1</sup>

'Il ne s'agit pas de copier les œuvres d'autrefois. . . . mais de s'inspirer de la méthode même des vieux maîtres d'œuvre en la mettant au service de l'idéal religieux et moral qui est le nôtre.'

<sup>1</sup> See 'THE LIBRARY,' October, 1915.

## 134 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

It is sad in looking through the volume to remember that some of the works of art referred to are no more, victims of that German *Kultur* that does not even spare Christian art: Rheims, Soissons, Venice, have all suffered under the plague.

Literature has had its influence on this particular form of art. Chateaubriand has shown how Christian art gave the human face an expression of beauty completely unknown to paganism. The romantic movement restored the Middle Ages to favour, and thus religious subjects again filled many canvases. Important paintings were commissioned for Paris churches, and a classical painter like Ingres, and a romantic one like Delacroix, responded to the demand. Bréhier hopes that, out of the incoherence and hesitation of modern Christian art as we know it, there may come a Renaissance in which

'la pensée qui anime l'art religieux doit s'efforcer de refléter quelque chose de la grandiose simplicité du texte évangélique . . . tout doit dans une composition religieuse se subordonner à l'idée.'

Religion not only occupies the critic of art at the present time, but also the historian; and Albert Autin in 'L'Échec de la Réforme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle,'<sup>1</sup> explains from the point of view of a historian, not of a theologian, the causes of the unsuccess of the Reformation in France, and, in so doing, furnishes a valuable contribution to the history of religious feeling. While making every use of documents and facts, the external aspect of history,

<sup>1</sup> Albert Autin, 'L'Échec de la Réforme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Contribution à l'Histoire du sentiment religieux.' 4 fr. 55. (Armand Colin.)

he endeavours, with a large share of success, to penetrate the secrets of men's souls; for he believes that the heart is the source of life, and that therein lies the definitive explanation of history. The second part of the book in which the author discusses temperaments in connection with ideas, is certainly the most original and interesting. He shows how the Reformation was not welcomed everywhere alike, and could never have become the religion of the majority of the French people, because it was unsuited to the Latin temperament. Such way as it made was due neither to politics, as in England, nor to social conditions, as in Germany, but to the fact that it seemed to some tempéraments to hold 'une grande espérance.'

'Un grand nombre d'âmes se sont laissé prendre au rêve enchanter d'une religion réduite à un minimum de formules et de rites, qui gagnerait en profondeur ce qu'elle perdait en extension, non pas individuelle, comme l'a dit Brunetière, mais individualiste, interiorisée, exigeant moins de routine et plus d'élan intérieur. Un souffle de pur evangélisme, d'enthousiaste folie, s'est répandu d'âme à âme au sein d'une foule aimante et généreuse.'

Then, little by little, after 1530, that enthusiasm was confined to fixed groups which constituted the new churches or communities. Thus, in the breaches, as it were, currents of ideas were generated that first opposed and then definitively destroyed the claims of the Reformed religion to be the State religion of France. Autin's point of view is well worth study, and the style and plan of his book makes it appeal to the cultivated general reader as well as to the professional historical student.

## 136 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

In view of present circumstances, when those of us, no longer young, have grave doubts if we shall ever wander again through the galleries of Europe, it is a distinct pleasure to turn over the pages of any volume that contains illustrations of some of our favourite pictures. I have been reading a life and critical study of 'Madame Vigée-Lebrun,' by Louis Hautecœur, that appears in Laurens's series of 'Les grands artistes.'<sup>1</sup> The volume contains reproductions of twenty-four of her best known portraits, mostly now in the galleries of the Louvre, of Versailles, and in private collections in France. Born in 1755, and dying in 1842, she outlived her fame, but she remains for posterity the painter *par excellence* of Marie Antoinette and many of the protagonists of the end of the *ancien régime*. Not a great or original artist, Mme. Lebrun had the gift of freshness, a feeling for colour, and the power of investing her sitters with charm; her portraits picture for us

'cette société française, souriante, sentimentale un peu, généreuse malgré ses erreurs, simple malgré ses manières et qui s'étourdissait aux dernières fêtes du régime finissant.'

In another direction the French seek to keep alive the spirit of patriotism and of pride in their country, and in so doing prove the advantage of not permitting art and literature and learning to be set aside even in time of war. M. Ferdinand Brunot, whose great work, 'Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900,' had reached the first part of

<sup>1</sup> Louis Hautecœur, 'Madame Vigée-Lebrun. Étude critique.' (Laurens.)

volume four, has postponed the publication of the second part in order to bring out volume five, 'Le Français en France et hors de France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,' because he deems the diffusion of the French language beyond the frontiers of France an important event in her national and international life, and, in his preface, states as his reason for detaching this from the second part of volume four (which will not be published until after the war) that

'dans un moment où il s'agit pour un grand et noble peuple de sauver sa vie et sa place dans le monde, rien n'est de trop de ce qui peut illustrer le rôle qu'il a joué dans l'histoire générale de la civilisation.'

Similarly the study of the French language in all its bearings is inculcated on young students, in France as elsewhere at present, chiefly young girls; and, to further that end, M. Joseph Anglade, professor at the University of Toulouse, has just published an admirable elementary grammar of old French,<sup>1</sup> the result of practical lessons, to serve as an introduction to the study of the texts because

'l'étude de notre ancienne littérature est pour les jeunes générations un devoir patriotique. . . . Car les commotions qui agitent les peuples et qui ébranlent les nations rappellent aux uns et aux autres leurs origines; n'oublions pas, maintenant plus que jamais, qu'au moyen âge nous avons conquis le monde par la poésie lyrique ou épique et que nous sommes les héritiers d'un passé très grand et d'une très belle civilisation: noblesse oblige.'

The glories of our own literature, ancient and modern, might be turned to a similar use by our

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Anglade, 'Grammaire élémentaire de l'ancien Français.' 4 fr. 80. (Armand Colin.)

## 138 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

professors of English. Ignorance of our past history and literature, only too widespread, accounts, in some measure, for many of the mistakes of the present time.

Julian Benda, however, in 'Les sentiments de Critias,' a sort of commonplace book on the war, takes a gloomy view of intellectual life, and especially after the war. He fears that there will be no public for disinterested thought. Doubtless, when Socrates returned from the front and his friends congratulated him on his exploits, he said, 'Never mind about them. How is it with philosophy?' Such, Benda declares, will not be the attitude of the university student of to-day when he returns from the fighting. The public will no longer respect the thinker, it will only admire the man of action. Yet Benda sees a glimmer of light, if not for ourselves, for our posterity, for it will care more for our thought and our art than for 'le fracas de nos armes.' Benda does not forget that some men of letters who, more or less, celebrated war in their writings—Byron, D'Annunzio, Péguy—seized the opportunity of living their dreams, but he considers that men who are heroic in their writings are commonly cautious in their acts.

It is well to hear all sides, but I must confess that, so far as my studies in contemporary French literature go, it seems likely that the high level of excellence that has prevailed during these four years of war, will be maintained till its end, and carried on in the new conditions that will arise afterwards.

Most of the other books I have to notice are either the direct outcome of war conditions or closely connected with them. But in nearly every case there is some permanent interest that makes them worthy of record.

I came by chance across the following sonnet, and, struck by its excellence, made inquiries as to its author. The sonnet is called 'Faits divers,' and combines a modern tone with the highest artistic form and expression :

Prés du cachot pérore et gesticule un groupe  
D'Athéniens, pressant les joueurs accoudés :  
Il doit perdre, par Zeus !—Non !—Si !—Fier coup de  
dès !  
Cris : vacarme. Un essaim de curieux s'attroupe.

Le soir vient. Dans l'azur, Sunium se découpe.  
Des éphèbes en deuil, des vieillards affligés  
Entrent les yeux au sol et de pleurs ravagés.  
—Un esclave les a suivis, portant la coupe—

Le jeu cesse. On chuchote. Un coquin va périr.  
Mais qui ? Pour quel forfait ? Chacun de s'enquérir :  
Est-ce un faux monnayeur, un transjuge, un pirate ?  
Le gardien qu'interroge un barbier déferent,  
Après avoir baillé, grommelle en s'étirant :  
'C'est ce gueux suborneur, à moitié fou : Socrate !'

I found the author to be a young poet, Marcel Toussaint-Collignon, who was killed in action, 13th October, 1916. He was a disciple of Hérédia, and his work, beyond his fine poem 'Le drapeau,' published in 1909, is little known to the public either of his own country or of ours. He was

140 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

born at Nancy, and when war broke out was professor of literature at the Lycée of Saint Quentin. His last published volume (there is another to follow) appeared after his death under the title of 'Le Dard et l'Épée, 1914-1916,'<sup>1</sup> and contains a number of poems on different aspects of the war in which, as in the sonnet quoted above, realism and romance are skilfully combined, and in which the Germans are treated with biting irony. As a Lorrainer, the poet had no illusions on their count. The little poems breathe a sane philosophy,

‘L'espoir sans résignation  
Guide et soutient la France armée.’

and a steadfast belief that

‘Le meurtre armé par la science,’

must be ‘à jamais confondu,’ and in the certainty of victory in this struggle,

‘Pour le Droit et pour la Patrie.’

A care for art, a desire to surprise its secrets, taste, refinement, strength, mark every line that Toussaint wrote.<sup>2</sup>

There is a distinct charm, and no little pathos, in Marie, Queen of Roumania's 'Mon Pays,' in its French dress.<sup>3</sup> Finished at Bucharest in 1914, it has

<sup>1</sup> Marcel Toussaint-Collignon, 'Le Dard et l'Épée, 1914-16.'  
<sup>2</sup> fr. (Lemerre.)

<sup>3</sup> His other published volumes are: 'Le Sculpteur de Sable'; 'Vers écrits sur l'eau'; 'Les Taciturnes.'

<sup>3</sup> Marie, Reine de Roumanie, 'Mon Pays.' Traduction de Jean Lahovary. 1 fr. 75. (Georges Crès.)

## SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 141

as an epilogue a couple of pages, dated Jassy, 1917, from the death-bed of an unknown soldier in the hospital which she was visiting. There are no politics in the little book, it is simply a description of the country and its people by one who, coming there a stranger, has learnt to understand the inhabitants and to inspire them with confidence in herself.

In recent fiction there is little that is striking. René Boylesve, who has lately been elected to the Academy, has scored a success with a kind of philosophical novel entitled '*Tu n'es plus rien*,' to prove that

*'provisoirement, et pour un temps que nous ne saurions évaluer, l'individu est mort. . . . L'unique espoir de résurrection est de se donner à la masse commune et de s'y confondre avec amour.'*

Thus the young widows are to re-marry in order that they may have children and so help France, and to take as husbands disabled, blinded, and disfigured soldiers. A treatise would have put the argument, I think, more forcibly than a novel, and have given opportunity for the expression of contrary views. Frankly, one misses the skill and fine psychological insight of the author of '*L'enfant à la balustrade*.' The volume forms the first of a series entitled '*Le Roman littéraire*,' published under the direction of Henri de Régnier, which is to include every type of novel, '*psychologique ou sentimental, lyrique ou documentaire, intime ou social*'.

René Bazin places the scene of his novel, '*La*

## 142 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

*Closerie de Champdolent*,' in Brittany, and at the French front in Champagne. The slight story is a mingling of love and war and Breton customs. Incidentally we learn something of the conditions of agriculture and of the fishing industry in Brittany, and of the relations between French officers and their men. The pathos of the narrative resides in the reconciliation of a husband and wife brought about by the war, but frustrated through the death of the former before it could be effected.

The letters of Pierre Masson (the author of 'Le Religion de Jean-Jacques Rousseau'),<sup>1</sup> who was killed in action 17th April, 1916, written to his wife, his mother, to other relatives and to friends between August, 1914, and April, 1916, make interesting reading. His comments on modern warfare with its inactivity and its disappointments, its large amount of talk, and small corresponding action, might well be pondered by our military and political leaders.

'Cette immobilité qui se prolonge, alors qu'on la croyait toute proche de finir, n'est pas génératrice d'ardeur: le mouvement nous manque trop pour avoir encore l'élan. Ne me croyez pas découragé: je ne le suis pas. Seulement la guerre est une chose qu'il faut agir et non méditer. La méditation est un dissolvant.'

Masson touches on a great psychological truth in the following passage, where he begs his wife not to worry about him, because

'les choses sont toujours bien moins effrayantes vécues que décrites, soit parce que les mots déforment les

<sup>1</sup> See 'THE LIBRARY,' January, 1917.

impressions, soit plutôt parce que les choses mêmes acclament progressivement le cœur et le corps aux émotions nouvelles.'

Masson really finished his Rousseau—his thesis for the doctorate—in the trenches, and had been promised leave to go to Paris to present it to the University, as is the custom, to discuss and defend it with the examining professors. But it was the crisis of Verdun, and all men were needed, and as it was found necessary at the moment to make Masson a 'commandant de compagnie,' he could not be spared from his post. His ready acceptance of such a situation is well brought out in a letter the day before his death to a friend who had congratulated him on the excellence of his book.

'Mais, pour l'instant, ce n'est point des livres qu'il s'agit. Il s'agit de tenir et de forcer la victoire, et, en attendant, de croire en elle . . . n'est-ce point la meilleure façon de rester fidèle à ceux qui sont morts pour la France en péril que de penser moins à eux qu'à la France, tant que le péril durera ?'.

The volume contains a preface by Victor Giraud and a biographical notice by Jacques Zeiller.

I may here call attention to a notable collection of letters from a soldier<sup>1</sup> that appeared in the 'Revue de Paris' in 1915 and has since been published as a volume. The author has been 'missing' since the beginning of April, 1915, and as no certain information of his death has been received, they are published anonymously. He was a young

<sup>1</sup> 'Lettres d'un soldat (Août, 1914—Avril, 1915).' Préface de André Chevillon. (Chapelot.)

## 144 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

painter who in these letters from the front proves himself a poet and a philosopher as well. The letters give the history of the spiritual progress of a soul that had to learn how to adapt itself to wholly new and unforeseen conditions, to break, as it were, with the past. The young man, naturally, did not find it easy to give up his old hopes of an artist's career, and at times feels acutely the immensity of the sacrifice.

*'Comme cette guerre est longue pour des gens qui avaient une tâche indéniable à remplir! Pourquoi suis-je ainsi sacrifié, quand d'autres, qui ne me valent pas, sont conservés? J'avais pourtant quelque chose de bon à faire sur terre.'*

But little by little he does succeed in adapting himself to his new life, and is even able, as an artist and a philosopher, to extract beauty from his sinister surroundings.

*'J'ai cueilli des fleurs dans la boue, gardez-les en souvenir de moi.'*

And in his last letter to his mother, written on the day of the attack in which he disappeared, he is able to say

*'Quoiqu'il arrive, la vie aura eu de la beauté.'*

There is an English translation of this book, but its charm and beauty can only be fully appreciated in the original.

*'Les diverses familles spirituelles de la France,'* by Maurice Barrès, is intended to prove, chiefly by the testimony of soldiers' letters, that all differ-

ences of creed and opinion vanished, at least in France, on 4th August, 1914. Yet Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Socialists, traditionalists, all, in defending France, defend their particular faith, and Barrès believes that this profound unanimity will endure after the war.

*'Nous sommes unis, en France, parce que, depuis l'intellectuel jusqu'au petit paysan, nous avons la claire vision de quelque chose de supérieur à nos petits intérêts personnels et une sorte d'instinct qui nous fait accepter joyeusement la sacrifice actif de nous-mêmes au triomphe de cet idéal.'*

Marcel Dupont has brought out a second volume of his '*En Campagne (1914-15)*,' a book of which fifty-eight editions have been issued, in which, as in the new work, '*En Campagne. L'attente. Impressions d'un officier de légère (1915-16-17)*,' he addresses those behind the front who suffer from the length of the war and often feel disheartened, and exhorts them not to complain and to see that their lamentations do not reach the trenches.

The different episodes are well told with the skill and charm of a practised writer, and are marked by reticence and tender feeling. '*L'heure du thé*' is perfect in its kind. An unmarried officer on brief leave invites two ladies to tea with him at his home in Rheims during the bombardment, and on the very day a bomb fell on the town hall and set it on fire. The ladies, who have allowed themselves an hour's respite from their works of mercy, braved the perils of the streets to

## 146 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

reach their host, and over tea and toast and music, strive for a space to forget the war—a *tendresse* on the part of the officer for the younger of his guests is implied—but in the midst of these calm domesticities bursts the *ordonnance*, saying, ‘Mon lieutenant! c'est tombé sur l'hôtel de ville et le feu s'y est mis.’ The charm is broken, and one of the guests observes, ‘Ellé (la guerre) ne veut pas qu'on l'oublie.’

\* \* \* \* \*

The following recently published books deserve attention:

**Steenstraete.** *Un deuxième Chapitre de l'histoire des fusiliers marins* (10 Novembre, 1914—20 Janvier, 1915). Par Charles le Goffic (Plon-Nourrit).

The first chapter of the deeds of Breton sailors was the same author's ‘Dixmude.’ The two volumes form a veritable epic of the Yser campaign based on documents, on personal narrations by those directly engaged, and are a notable contribution to the study of one phase of the war.

**L'héroïsme pendant la guerre.** *Portraits de la belle France.* Par Maurice Talmeyr.

The author shows how all sorts and conditions of men—the great general and the private soldier, the man of the people and the man of high social position, the priest and the schoolmaster, the nun and the sick-nurse, the learned and the ignorant, the noble and the peasant, the artist and the artisan, the man on the confines of old age and the man still almost a child, have, in one vast communion, fought and died for France. A certain number of concrete

## SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 147

cases in all these varied ranks are taken, their deeds recounted, and an attempt made to show in their lives and deaths 'la belle France et la France immortelle, la France héroïque, la vraie et la bonne France.'

*En marge du drame. Journal d'une Parisienne pendant la guerre, 1914-1915.* Par la Baronne. J. Michaux.

The book is chiefly valuable for the extracts from German correspondence, newspapers, and magazines to which in the earlier part of the war the author had access. The passages quoted are full of the most amazing lies. It is to be hoped that later on some one will take the trouble to refute the manifold false statements especially about England made by German newspapers for consumption in neutral countries. Mme. Michaux's volume will give excellent aid in that connection.

*. Au dessus des batailles. Carnet de guerre d'un aviateur.* Par C. H. A. André.

Diary notes made by a flying-man, July, 1914—December, 1916. His adventures are simply related, and he gives a sincere description of facts rather than of sensations, and thereby helps us to realize what flying men actually do.

*La nation contre la race. II. République et barbares.* Par André Suarès.

An argument for nations against races. 'Les races sont menées par les prophètes et les couronnes. Les nations sont des peuples qui croient se conduire eux-mêmes ou, du moins, qui s'y essaient.' For example Germany, Austria, and Turkey are not nations; they are merely the

## 148 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

tools of crowns. The volume contains a chapter, entitled 'Kaiser chef de la race,' a penetrating character sketch of the German Emperor, full of point and irony.

### L'Impérialisme économique allemand. Par Henri Lichtenberger et Paul Petit (Flammarion).

An attempt to describe Germany's effort at expansion as seen in the present war, and to discover the conditions of the economic struggle that will ensue after the war. The authors insist on the menace of the German peril and on the necessity if the nations of the *entente* desire to continue 'à vivre libres,' of a collective and sustained effort for defence and organization.

### Les préjugés ennemis de l'histoire de France. Par Louis Dimier (Nouvelle librairie nationale).

A new edition of a work published ten years ago. It contains an admirable lecture on Fustel de Coulanges, delivered in 1905, the historian who wrote 'l'histoire imparfaitement observée nous divise: c'est par l'histoire mieux connue que l'œuvre de conciliation doit commencer.' Dimier's book should be read and pondered by those who would learn the best attitude in which to study history.

### L'exécutif en temps de guerre. Les pleins pouvoirs (Angleterre, Italie, Suisse). 5 fr. Par Gaston Jèze (Giard et Brière).

An exposition by a professor of law in the University of Paris of the workings of D.O.R.A. in the three countries named. He points out that England, 'le pays parlementaire par excellence' is one of the countries in which the executive government has exercised and still exercises in the course of the war the widest discretionary powers.

## SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 149

Chapter II. (pp. 9-38) and its Appendix (pp. 128-78) form a most useful summary for ready reference of what has been done in England.

*Le Président Wilson et l'évolution de la politique étrangère des États-Unis.* Par Sir Thomas Barclay. With a preface by Paul Painlevé. 4 fr. 55. (Armand Colin).

An account, useful not only to the French but to us, of the policy and the personality of President Wilson, showing the difficulties he had to encounter, and the prudence he had to use in order not to lose touch with the opinion of the majority of his people, and a testimony to the knowledge, powers of observation, and linguistic versatility of its author.

*Sur les routes de la Victoire.* Par William Martin. With a preface by Colonel Feyler.

The author lived in Berlin for several years before the war, in France for the first eighteen months of it, and later in Switzerland. He well sums up the German attitude to war when he writes: 'Le militarisme n'est pas l'armée. C'est un système qui subordonne, dès le temps de paix, toutes les préoccupations de l'Etat à la préparation de la guerre. Ailleurs, la guerre est considérée comme une situation anormale, à laquelle il faut songer, sans doute, mais pour laquelle il ne faut pas vivre exclusivement.'

ELIZABETH LEE.

## PYNSON'S DEALINGS WITH JOHN RUSSHÉ.

**S**N April, 1909, 'THE LIBRARY,' under the title 'Two Lawsuits of Richard Pynson,' had the pleasure of printing an article by Mr. H. R. Plomer, quoting documents which, in addition to their personal interest, threw more light on the size of editions and the wholesale prices of books in England in the fifteenth century than any which had previously been published. The documents were concerned with cross-actions between Pynson and the executors of John Russhe, who died on 10th May, 1498, and was buried in All Hallows, Barking. The executors were Russhe's widow Isabel, who subsequently married Thomas Grey, Esq. (afterwards Sir Thomas), and one John Wellys. The action on Pynson's side was to recover the balance of an account for printing and supplying books to Russhe's order; that commenced by Russhe's executors was for the balance of an account for £300 for various goods supplied to Pynson. Mr. Charles Welch has now placed at our disposal a document of 1502-03, giving an earlier plea by Pynson that the action against him might be removed from the Lord Mayor's Court to Chancery in order to obtain a fairer hearing. It contains no bibliographical details, but by dating

back the transaction 'xii yeres passed or there aboutys,' shows that the dealings began, as Mr. Plomer conjectured, quite at the commencement of Pynson's career as a printer. It will be noted that Isabel Russhe's second husband, who in the later pleadings figures as a knight, is called esquire, and we must here be almost at the beginning of the long lawsuit.

'To the right reverent Father in god William Busshop of London and keper of the kynges grett seale Humble shewith and compleynyth vnto your gracious Lordship your dayly Oratour Richard Pynson bokebynder That where xij yeres passed or there aboutys he bought of oon John Rushe nowe deceyyd certeyn warys for somes of money betwene them agreed which he hath truely contentyd and payd to the seid John Rushe long tyme before his deth thys notwithstandingyn Thomas Grey Esquier and Isabell his wyff late the wyff of the said Rushe and John Wellys Gentilman the seid Isabell and John namyng them executours of the testament of the seid John Rushe haue lately affermed a pleynte of accompte ageynst the seid Richard before the Maire and Aldermen of the Citiie of London feynynge by the same that the seid Richard shuld receyue goodys and catallys of the said John Rushe to the value of CCC li for to yeld accompts therof to the seid John Rushe and by cause that your seid Suppliaunt shuld not wage his lawe in the seid pleynt the seid receipte is supposed to be had by the handys of dyuers personnes where as some of them be dede and some be merchaunt Straungers abydyng beyond the See. Where if the seid John Rushe

## 152 PYNSON'S DEALINGS WITH RUSSH.

had leuyd he wold ne ought neuer to haue greuyd  
your besecher for that cause Also gracious lord  
the seid John Wellys beyng a lernyd man and of  
grette acqueyntaunce in the Citie of London hath  
of his pure malice which he beryth toward your  
Suppliaunt for other causes entendyng to vndoo  
and vterly to distroye hym hath not oonly com-  
mensyd the seid accion but also hath supposed the  
seid resceite to be had in the parissh of Seynt  
Swythyns in London were he is moche conuersaunt  
and frynded, entendyng therby to haue an enquest  
to passe ontruely for his purpos and therupon to  
condempne the seid Richard Pynson to his vndoing  
And if this grette and unportable somme of money  
hadde be due the seid John Rushe in his lyff and  
the seid executours after his deth before thys tyme  
wold haue demaunded it In consideracion of these  
premisses and for that your Suppliaunt exersissith  
the crafte of pryntyng of bokys to the erudicion and  
comfort of many wele disposed Clerkys and lernyd  
men and is lyke to forsake his seid occupacion if he  
shuld be condempned in this greuous and ontrue  
accion that of your good and gracious disposicion  
it wyll please your good lordship to graunt a wrytt  
of cerciorare to be directed to the seid Meire and  
Aldermen commaundynge them by the same to cer-  
tifie the seid accion before the kyng in his Courte  
of Chauncery there to be examyned and determyned  
as shall accorde with right and good conscience.'

(Endorsed) 'Coram dño R. in Canc' sua in quindena  
Pasche px' futur.' ('Early Chancery Proceedings,'  
Bundle 269, no. 66.)